

Appl. No. 10/030,761
Amendment dated February 24, 2004
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of November 20, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 30, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for indefinite and confusing language. Applicants concur with this assessment and present amendments to the subject claims for the purpose of clarifying the description of the structure claimed. If these modifications are acceptable to the Examiner, then Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of these grounds of rejection.

Claims 13-21 and 23-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trojanowski et al., or Brant in view of Newman. Applicants graciously acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter. Nonetheless, Applicants must respectfully traverse the rejection presented for the following reasons.

The combination of Trojanowski et al. or Brant in view of Newman fail to recognize the novel and unobvious features of the present invention. Neither of the primary references disclose a tooth brush in which the bristles are configured in a wave-like pattern along the longitudinal axis of the shaft of the brush. Newman only discloses a wave-like pattern which is configured "transversely" to the axis of the handle. There is no suggestion from Newman to modify the brushes of either of the primary references so that the alternating high/low bristle pattern runs along the longitudinal axis of the brush handle. It is thus respectfully submitted that the combined teachings of the cited references would not have rendered the claimed

Appl. No. 10/030,761
Amendment dated February 24, 2004
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of November 20, 2003

invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. The withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants ask for reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. Applicants further ask for extension of the period for response to be extended one month to March 20, 2004 and authorize a charge to Deposit Account No. 01-1250 in the amount of \$ 110.00 for the extension fee. Order No. 04-0071. Should any fees be due for entry and consideration of this Amendment that have not been accounted for, the Commissioner is authorized to charge them to Deposit Account No. 01-1250.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory M. Hill
(Reg. No. 31,369)
Attorney for Applicants
610-278-4964

GMH/img

Henkel Corporation
Patent Law Department
2200 Renaissance Blvd., Suite 200
Gulph Mills, PA 19406